

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14, 20-27, 29-31, 33, 39-46, 48-50, 52, and 59-61 are under consideration in the application, with the claims 9, 13, 15-19, 28, 32, 34-38, 47, 51 and 53-57 having been withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 1-7, 10-12, 14, 20-26, 29-31, 33, 39-45, 48-50, 52, 59 and 60 have been amended, claim 58 has been canceled, and Claim 61 has been added. Claims 1, 20, 39 and 59-61 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 20, 39 and 10, 29, 48 (including their dependent claims) are objected to.

It is believed that all of these claims objections have been obviated by the above-noted claims amendments. As to the stated objection to claims 10, 29 and 48, it is noted that the allegedly objectionable language cited by the Examiner does not appear in those claims. Rather that language is in claims 12, 14, 31, 33, 50 and 52, which have been amended accordingly

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 101**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to a non-statutory subject matter. It is believed that this rejection has been overcome by amendments to claim 1 which specify that method steps thereof are performed at or by a central computer.

Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as pertaining to a non-statutory class. Applicants do not understand these rejections. Claim 59 is directed to a programmed central computer that includes a memory and a processor, and thus clearly is directed to a statutory class of subject matter. Claim 60 is already in the form of "computer readable medium having computer executable software code stored thereon", which the Examiner concedes, at the bottom of page 6 of the pending Office Action, is statutory. Applicants therefore respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 59 and 60 under § 101.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(e)**

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14, 20-27, 29-31, 33, 39-46, 48-50, 52, 59 and 60 are rejected as being anticipated by Reisman, US Patent No. 6,594,692 ("Reisman").

The present invention is directed to substantially different subject matter and to solving a completely different problem from the Reisman reference. It is believed that the above amendments to the independent claims 1, 20, 39, 59 and 60 now clearly define subject matter that is very different from the disclosure of the Reisman reference.

The Reisman reference is primarily concerned with providing an efficient technique for downloading updated materials, such as the current issues of magazines, to subscribers of magazines and other periodicals. By contrast, the present invention is concerned with allowing users of the World Wide Web to learn when it is worthwhile to re-visit a website because the content of the website has been updated. To achieve the latter objective, the central controller described in the present application gathers information from websites to determine when updating has occurred or will occur. The central controller also allows users to access pages provided by the central controller, where the pages indicate when updating will occur (or that updating has occurred) for websites of interest to the users.

Applicants will now turn to a discussion of specific claim language that distinguishes the claims from the Reisman reference. Claim 1 is directed to a "method of transmitting at least one web site update schedule". The method of claim 1 includes "receiving at a central computer, via a communication network, information from a plurality of web sites, said information indicative of future times at which content of said web sites will be updated". The method further includes "receiving at said central computer a request from a user computer" and "said central computer responding to said request by providing a display page to said user computer, said display page including display information that presents the future time at which the content of at least one of said web sites will be updated".

Applicants note that Reisman does not disclose a central computer receiving, via a communication network, information from a plurality of web sites, where the information indicates future times at which content of the web sites will be updated. Reisman is not

concerned with updating of contents of web sites and does not discuss information that indicates future times when such updates will occur.

It is also noted that Reisman does not disclose a central computer which provides a display page to a user computer, where the display page includes display information that presents the future time at which content of a web site will be updated. Again, no such display information is disclosed in Reisman.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1, at least as now amended, is clearly patentably distinguished from the Reisman reference. The other rejected independent claims, which are claims 20, 39 and 59-61, have been amended in a similar manner to claim 1 and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 1. The remaining rejected claims are dependent claims which are submitted as patentable on the same basis as their parent independent claims.

Claims 1, 20, 39, 59 and 60 are rejected as being anticipated by Nobakht, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,873B1 ("Nobakht").

Like the Reisman reference, Nobakht is directed to quite different subject matter from the present invention.

Nobakht describes a system in which navigation of the Internet is facilitated by allowing the user to select channel numbers to access web sites. In its most nearly relevant teachings, Nobakht calls for scheduling updates of local channel tables stored at the user's computers. However, this teaching is concerned with updates of data tables at the user's computers, not with updating of content at web sites. More specifically, the Nobakht reference does not disclose receiving, at a central computer, information that indicates a future time when content at a plurality of websites will be updated. Neither does the reference disclose display information provided to a user computer from a central computer to present the future time at which content of a web site will be updated. It is therefore submitted that, at least in light of the amendment of claims 1, 20, 39, 59 and 60, the rejection based on the Nobakht reference should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Since generic claims are allowable, it is requested that the non-elected species claims be considered and allowed.

\* \* \* \* \*

New claim 61 is an independent claim that is directed to a “method of transmitting information about at least one website update schedule”. The method of claim 61 includes “receiving at a central computer, via a communication network, information from a plurality of web sites, said information indicative of most recent times at which content of said web sites was updated”. The method of claim 61 includes “receiving at said central computer a request from a user computer” and “said central computer responding to said request by providing a display page to said user computer, said display page including display information that indicates whether at least one of said web sites was updated since a user of the computer last visited said at least one of said web sites”.


The subject matter of claim 61 is clearly different from the prior art references relied upon by the Examiner, since those references have nothing to do with providing display data to a user computer to indicate whether a web site has been updated since the user last visited the web site. It is therefore submitted that claim 61 is patentably distinguished from the references relied upon by the Examiner.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

September 12, 2005  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nathaniel Levin  
Registration No. 34,860  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Five Elm Street  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-3460